



02-24-06

IPW

MacPherson Kwok, Chen & Heid LLP

1762 Technology Drive, Suite 226

San Jose, CA 95110

Tel. (408) 392-9250

Fax (408) 392-9262

2402 Michelson Drive, Suite 210

Irvine, CA 92612

Tel. (949) 752-7040

Fax (949) 752-7049

Email: mailbox@macpherson-kwok.com

www.macpherson-kwok.com

February 22, 2006

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Re: Applicant: Oleg Siniaguine
Assignee: Tru-Si Technologies, Inc.
Title: Plasma Processing Comprising Three Rotational Motions Of An Article Being Processed
Serial No.: 10/627,038 Filed: July 24, 2003
Examiner: Arancibia, Maureen Gramaglia Group Art Unit: 1763
Docket No.: M-7554-1D US

Dear Sir:

Transmitted herewith are the following documents in the above-identified application:

- (1) Return Receipt Postcard;
- (2) This Transmittal Letter (1 page in duplicate);
- (3) Amendment (6 pages); and
- (4) Applicants' Record of Substance of Interview (MPEP 713.04) (3 pages).

☒ The fee has been calculated as shown below:**CLAIMS AS AMENDED**

	Claims Remaining <u>After Amendment</u>		Highest No. Previously <u>Paid For</u>		Present <u>Extra</u>		<u>Rate</u>		Additional <u>Fee</u>
Total Claims	9	Minus	20	=	0	x	\$50.00	\$	0.00
Independent Claims	1	Minus	3	=	0	x	\$200.00	\$	0.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Fee of _____ for the first filing of one or more multiple dependent claims per application							\$	

Total additional fee for this Amendment:

\$

- ☒ Conditional Petition for Extension of Time: If an extension of time is required for timely filing of the enclosed document(s) after all papers filed with this transmittal have been considered, an extension of time is hereby requested.
- ☒ Please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-2257 in the amount of \$ 0.00
- ☒ Also, charge any additional fees required and credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 50-2257

Total: \$ 0.00**EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.:****EV 861 968 917 US**

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Shenker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 34,250



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/627,038 Filing Date: July 24, 2003
Confirmation No.: 3735
First Named Inventor: Oleg Siniaguine
Assignee: Tru-Si Technologies, Inc.
Examiner: Arancibia, Maureen Art Unit: 1763
Gramaglia
Attorney Docket No.: M-7554-1D US

San Jose, California
February 22, 2006

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPLICANTS' RECORD OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW (MPEP 713.04)

Dear Sir:

This is a record of the substance of the telephone interview between Examiners Maureen Arancibia and Parviz Hassanzadeh and the undersigned held on February 14, 2004 regarding the Office Action dated December 27, 2005.

1. With respect to the 35 USC 112 rejection, the undersigned suggested deleting the words "non-contact" in Claim 2 and reciting that the article holder has a body which emits one or more gas flows towards the article to develop vacuum to hold the wafer adjacent to the body, the one or more gas flows preventing the article from contacting the body. The undersigned stated that such amendment was supported by the specification, page 9, last paragraph, and page 12, line 25 ("non-contact" holder). Examiner Arancibia stated that the undersigned should indicate the support for the amendment in his remarks in response to the Office Action as the examiner would study the amendment to determine if it was supported.

2. Regarding the section 103 rejection, the undersigned had received from Examiner Arancibia an English translation of the Japanese reference (Hiuga) by fax. The undersigned stated that there was no indication that the Japanese reference taught wafer rotation by pins 12. Pins 12 rotated in order to position the pieces 13 underneath the wafer 11 (Fig. 4(D)) to pick up the wafer. The wafer was sitting on susceptor 21 at the time (was “fastened” on the susceptor), so there was no indication that the friction between the wafer and the susceptor would allow the wafer to rotate. Therefore, Hiuga does not provide a motivation to make Tokmulin’s pins 17 rotatable.

The undersigned also pointed out that the office action, page 6, second paragraph, stated that the motivation was “to prevent the article from sticking to the pins”. However, the references do not teach or suggest that their wafers stuck to the pins, or that sticking to the pins would present a problem even if present.

The undersigned further stated that the invention was directed to rotating a flying, unstable wafer (held in position by gas) around an axis passing through the wafer in the presence of two other rotations. This is not a simple problem.

The examiners indicated that they would thoroughly consider such arguments in a response to the office action, possibly making another prior art search.

Any questions regarding this case can be addressed to the undersigned at the telephone number below.

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.:
EV 861 968 917 US

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Shenker
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 34,250
Telephone: (408) 392-9250, Ext. 212

Law Offices Of
MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid LLP
1762 Technology Drive, Suite 226
San Jose, CA 95110